UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,161	05/10/1999	LAWRENCE CUI	OLAL1006.002	7164

23910   7590   03/17/2004

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 December 2000_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the response filed on 12/23/2003.

This action is made Final.

2.   In the response, claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1-2, and 14 are independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claim 1 recites "stripping off any cookies....and storing the cookies in a repository"

lines 4-5. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the storing

of stripped cookies in the repository.

5.   Claims 2-13 recite "removing cookies....and storing information contained in each

cookie in a cookie repository" claim 2, lines 3-4. There is insufficient information in the

specification disclosure to support the storing of removed cookies in the repository.

6.   Claim 11 recites "storing the information from the cookie repository when the lifetime

expires" line 2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support the

storing of information from the cookie repository.

7.   Claim 14 recites "removing information from a document and storing that information in

a repository" line 2. There is insufficient information in the specification disclosure to support

the storing of removed cookies in the repository.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1-14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner

(Pat. # 6,085,224, 7/4/00, filed on 3/11/97), in view of McGee (Pat. # 6,393,468 B1, 5/21/02,

filed on 3/13/98).

        Regarding independent claim 1, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page

headers (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *generating a*

session id to identify a new session. However, McGee discloses the generation of a user's session

index or *session id* (col. 9, lines 14-21, col.10, lines 34-67, and col.11, lines 56-67). It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

generated the session id, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee

teaches the closing of the browsing session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out

period. Thus, the session id provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up

server resources unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy

amount of time.

Furthermore, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers sent to a

user. The cookies are stored in a web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a

requested web page (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach

appending the session id to all of the links embedded in the response page and sending the

modified response page, with the new header. However, McGee discloses the appending of a

user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (col.10,lines 34-67,

col.11,lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in the web page, and combine the

teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized

users can access web pages (col.4, lines 43-67), so that the information would be safeguarded by

providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users.

Regarding independent claim 2, Wagner discloses the requesting, and browsing of web

pages from a web server by a web browser (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to

explicitly teach *generating a unique session id in response to a request from a client browser.*

However, McGee discloses the generation of a user's session index or *session id* (col. 9, lines 14-

21, col.10, lines 34-67, and col.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the session id, and combine the

teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee teaches above the closing of the browsing

session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id

provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up server resources

unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Furthermore, Wagner discloses the removal or deletion of cookies from web page

response headers in a web page before it is sent to a user's browser. The cookies are stored in a

web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a requested web page (col. 2, lines

1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach *appending the unique session id to each*

URL in the response page before sending the response page to the client browser. However,

McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded

in a web pages (col.10,lines 34-67, col.11,lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links

in the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a

system where only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be

safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-

67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses determining whether a

browser accepts cookies, and if does not deleting those cookies from the HTTP headers

(col.2,lines 54-col.3,line 67).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the access of web pages

from a server by a client (col.8, lines 24-col. 9, line 39). Wagner fails to explicitly teach

encrypting the session id. However, McGee teaches the encrypting of a session index or session

id, by masking it within a random 10 digit number (col.11, lines 56-col.12, line 12). It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

encrypted the session id, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can

access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users,

and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses determining whether a

session has expired, and closing the session if it has expired (col.2,lines 54-col.3,line 67).

Wagner fails to explicitly teach *checking the request for an existing session id before generating*

a unique session id. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have encrypted the session id, because Wagner teaches above the generation

of a new session index or id to establish a new session. This provides the advantage of allowing a

user to continue browsing after a session has been closed due to inactivity.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Wagner discloses the retrieval of cookies

from a server storage or repository (col.2, lines 31-col. 3, line 67). Wagner fails to explicitly

teach *cookie repository corresponding to the existing session id.* However, McGee discloses the

generation of a user's session index or *session id* (col. 9, lines 14-21, col.10, lines 34-67, and

col.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to have generated the session id, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and

McGee, because McGee teaches above the closing of the browsing session if the time between

server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id provides the benefit of saving

server resources by avoiding tying up server resources unnecessarily, when a user has not access

the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Wagner discloses generating a cookie

header, and inserting cookies in the response web page (col. 2, lines 31-67).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Wagner discloses generating a cookie

header, and appending cookies in the header of the response web page (col. 2, lines 31-67).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the retrieval of web

pages from an external server storage or repository (col.2, lines 31-col. 3, line 67).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the retrieval of cookies

from a server storage or repository (col.2, lines 31-col. 3, line 67). Wagner fails to explicitly

teach *setting a lifetime for a session corresponding to the unique session id*. However, McGee

discloses setting a lifetime for the session index or id to prevent a user from exceeding a time-out

period of inactivity (col.8, lines 24-col.9, line 39). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have generated the session id, and combine

the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee teaches above the closing of the browsing

session if the time between server access exceeds a time-out period. Thus, the session id

provides the benefit of saving server resources by avoiding tying up server resources

unnecessarily, when a user has not access the server in a predetermined lengthy amount of time.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Wagner discloses the removal or

deletion of cookies from web page response headers in a web page before it is sent to a user's

browser. The cookies are stored in a web server, which introduces these cookies into the header

of a requested web page. The storage takes place during the web browsing session of the client's

browser (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses determining whether a

user has disabled cookies' reception in a browser, which is done through a function for deleting

the cookies (col.2, lines 54-col.3, line 67).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 2, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies

from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67).

Wagner fails to explicitly teach *receiving the request from the client browser to a proxy server,*

the proxy server hosting the cookie repository. McGee teaches a web server HTML page store

360—*proxy server*—located within an Internet server 300 for transmitting requested web pages

to a requesting user (col.6,lines 35-67, fig. 3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored the cookies in a proxy server repository,

and combine Wagner, and McGee, because McGee, because McGee discloses a system where

only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be safeguarded by

providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-67).

Regarding independent claim 14, Wagner discloses the removal or deletion of cookies

from web page response headers in a web page before it is sent to a user's browser. The cookies

are stored in a web server which introduces these cookies into the header of a requested web

page (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67).   Wagner fails to explicitly teach *appending an*

identifier to each link in the document and sending that document to the client. However, McGee

discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session id* to all the URLs embedded in a

web pages (col.10,lines 34-67, col.11,lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in

the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a

system where only authorized users can access web pages, so that the information would be

safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users (col.4, lines 43-

67).

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Regarding the 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph rejections, the applicant has indicated that

there is support for the limitation of storing cookies in a repository(page 4, L.8-11). The

examiner agrees that support for the storage of cookies in a repository is found in the

specification. However, the stripping off cookies, and storing those cookies in a repository, is

not found in the specification, because the specification recites the following:

> *After getting the response page, the proxy server first <u>strips off any cookies</u> set by the*
> *external web site from the response header. <u>The cookies,</u> owned by a particular session*
> *and identified by the session id, are typically stored in a cookie repository for*
> *subsequent requests within the session (page 3, L.2-17).*

According to the specification above, the cookies being stored in the repository are the

cookies, which are *owned by a particular session and identified by the session id*, and NOT the

cookies *set by the external web site*. This also raises the question of which cookies are stored in

the repository? the cookies which are *owned by a particular session and identified by the*

session id, as indicated by the specification above, or the stripped off cookies referred to by

claim 1 (lines 4-5). There is a contradiction between the specification, and the claims.

The applicant states that Wagner does not teach the stripping cookies, and storing the

cookies in a repository (page 4, L.22-26). The Examiner disagrees, because Wagner discloses

the deletion of cookies from web page headers sent to a user. The cookies are normally stored in

a web server which introduces cookies into the header of a requested web page (col. 2, lines 1-

67, col.3, lines 1-67).

Moreover, the Applicants state that neither Wagner, nor McGee teach appending a

session id to all the URLs embedded in a response page (page 5, lines 26-page 6, line 11). The

Examiner disagrees, because McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or *session*

id to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (col.10,lines 34-67, col.11,lines 56-67). Each URL

is replaced with a token. The token consists of the URL, and other added or appended

information such as the session index.

In view of the remarks above, claims 1-14 remain rejected.

Conclusion

11.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

I.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at

least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

    Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

    Washington, D.C. 20231

    Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306, (for all** Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

3/10/04

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER